

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 24 2008

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Inventor: Lane Lee, et al.

Application No. 09/940,174

Filing Date: 08/27/2001

For: System and Method For Detecting  
Unauthorized Copying of Encrypted Data

Examiner: Calvin Hewitt, II

Art Unit: 3621

Confirmation No. 5308

Attorney Docket No.: M-12038 US

**APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JUL 24 2008

**Status of Claims**

Claims 4, 5, 6 – 8, and 10 – 23 are cancelled.

Claims 1 – 3, 9, 15, 17, 18, 21 and 22 are pending and are at least twice rejected by the non-final Office Action dated December 8, 2006.

The rejection of claims 1 – 3, and 9 is appealed.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 24 2008

**Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed on Appeal**

- 1) Whether, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), claims 1-3 and are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,782,190 to Morito.
- 2) Whether, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), claim 3 is unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,190 to Morito in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,700 to Ram et al.

**Argument**

1) Applicants' arguments in the Opening Brief have not been fully addressed by the Examiner's Answer

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that he will give patentable weight to the conditional limitations. However, Applicants respectfully note that their remaining arguments were disregarded and given no response in the Examiner's Answer. In that regard, the analysis used in the Examiner's answer gives no weight or consideration to express claim limitations. For example, claim 1 recites the limitation of "detecting an unauthorized action *solely from the pre-recorded identifier being located in the writeable portion*" (emphasis added). Although this limitation has been stressed during prosecution and in the appeal brief, claim 1 is deemed to be anticipated by Morito (USP 6,782,190), a reference that actively teaches away from any such a detection. Applicants will once again explain why Morito teaches away from such a detection.

Morito describes his copy control protection with regard to Figure 7, which illustrates both the creation of a disk (steps S9 through S12) as well as the playback of the disk (steps s13 through S16). A Morito disk has a laser-inscribed bar code that acts as disk identifier (denoted as Sp, see, e.g, Col. 5, lines 63-65 with regard to step s13). This disk identifier is also written to the data area (see, e.g., Col. 5, lines 59-60 with regard to step s9). It may thus be seen that if an unauthorized copy of the disk is made, the data area will be copied over to the

new disk with the disk identifier from the original disk. But this new disk will have a different laser-inscribed disk identifier. A Morito player can then identify this difference by testing if the laser-inscribed identifier ( $S_p$ ) equals the data area identifier ( $S_d$ ).

It may thus be seen how different Applicants method is – Applicants were guarding against the copying of ROM data into a RAM portion of another ROM/RAM disk. In that regard, Applicants developed different types of identifiers for their ROM and RAM disk portions. Thus, by having these different types of identifiers, the mere presence of a ROM identifier in the RAM portion identifies a disk as a bootleg. Hence the recitation in claim 1 of the "detecting an unauthorized action *solely from the pre-recorded identifier being located in the writeable portion*" (emphasis added) limitation. In contrast, Morito must read both the identifier in his ROM portion and the identifier in his RAM portion and compare them to determine if he has a forgery. Indeed, there is no "pre-recorded content" in a Morito disk as would be understood by anyone of ordinary skill in the art – pre-recorded content is what the consumer wants in obtaining such a disk. It is substantive data whereas the identifier in Morita's pre-recorded area is meta-data, not the pre-recorded content the consumer is interested in. Thus, whether a Morita identifier is located in the writeable portion gives a Morito disk drive no cause to detect an unauthorized action. Only by further comparing the Morito identifier ( $S_p$ ) to the  $S_d$  identifier can Morito detect an unauthorized copy.

Because of these differences between Morito and the claimed invention, there is no teaching or suggestion in Morito for the claim 1 act of "determining whether the identifier identifies itself as a pre-recorded identifier or a written identifier" because Morito has only one type of identifier that is stamped into the ROM area during manufacture and then copied and written to the RAM area during a write operation. In addition, Morito has not teaching or suggestion for the act of "if the identifier identifies itself as a pre-recorded identifier and is located in the writeable portion of the optical disk; detecting an unauthorized action solely from the pre-recorded identifier being located in the writeable portion" such that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3 are patentable over

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 24 2008

Morito.

2) The Ram reference adds nothing further to Morito

The Ram reference does nothing to cure the infirmities of the Morito reference discussed above. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, and 3 are patentable over the combination of the Morito and Ram references.

**Conclusion**

Therefore, in light of the foregoing arguments, Applicants respectfully request the Honorable Board of Appeals to reverse the decision of the Examiner with respect to claims 1 -3.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

July 23, 2008

By:



Jonathan W. Hallman

Reg. No. 42,622